



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Adress: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/572,192	08/16/2006	Thomas Schlegel	23564	2643
535	7590	11/19/2008	EXAMINER	
K.F. ROSS P.C. 5683 RIVERDALE AVENUE SUITE 203 BOX 900 BRONX, NY 10471-0900			REGO, DOMINICE	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
		2618		
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
11/19/2008	PAPER			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/572,192	Applicant(s) SCHLEGEL ET AL.
	Examiner DOMINIC E. REGO	Art Unit 2618

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 August 2006.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 15 March 2006 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-166/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to the application filed on August 16, 2006.

Claims 1-12 are pending and presented for prosecution.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 4-7 and 11-12 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim should refer to other claims in the alternative only. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, the claims 4-7 and 11-12 have not been further treated on the merits.

3. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: a closing bracket ")" has been missing in line 1. In line 2, the phrase "that" has been repeated twice. In line 25, Applicant recites limitations "the communication device (5) parentheses". The underlining part is not comprehensive to the Examiner. Appropriate correction is required.

Drawings

4. The drawings are objected to because, as required by 37 CFR 1.84 (l), which addresses character of lines, numbers, and letters in drawings:

All drawings must be made by a process which will give them satisfactory reproduction characteristics. Every line, number, and letter must be durable, clean, black (except for color drawings), sufficiently dense and dark, and uniformly thick and well-defined. The weight of all lines and letters must be heavy enough to permit adequate reproduction. This requirement

applies to all lines however fine, to shading, and to lines representing cut surfaces in sectional views. Lines and strokes of different thicknesses may be used in the same drawing where different thicknesses have a different meaning.

Drawings 1-7 are not satisfactory. Shading should be removed from figures 3,5, and 6a-c. Lines and lettering of figures 1-7 are not clean and well defined. Figures 2,4, and 7 are hand drawn for a proper examination, the submitted drawing should be computerized drawings. There is no level for fig. 2. Figure 2, items 2,43,44 and figure 4, items 44 and 49 are repeated twice. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-3 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Bosch (US Patent #6,792,296) in view of Bork (US Patent #6,255,800).

Regarding claim 1, Van Bosch teaches adapter part (43, 71, 72, 73), for a connection system (11) that that serves to connect mobile radio terminals (51, 52, 53) with electronics (2) installed in a vehicle, the connecting system (1) incorporating a base part (3) for permanent installation in the vehicle (*Figure 1, base part 24 for permanent installation in the vehicle*) and one or a plurality of retaining parts (41, 42) (*Figure 2, retaining part 30*), each of which accommodates a mobile radio terminal (51, 52) (Fig 2, item 22) that can be connected through a second mechanical and electrical interface (Fig 2, items 28 A and 28B) (12) to the base part (3) (*Figure 2, item 24; Col 4, lines 26-43*), characterized in that the adapter part (43, 71, 72, 73) incorporates: the second mechanical and electrical interface (12) (Fig 2, items 28 A and 28B) for electrical and mechanical connection to the base part (3) of the connection system (11) (*Figure 2, item 24; Col 4, lines 26-43*), the second mechanical and electrical interface (Fig 2, items 28 A and 28B) being an interface for the connection of retaining parts (*Figure 2, item*

30) for mobile radio terminals (Fig 2, item 22), except for that incorporates a control device (45, 47) for communication through the second interface by means of a first, universal interface and for converting the first, universal protocol into a second, terminal-specific protocol; and in that the adapter part (43) has a communication device (6) for wireless communication with a mobile radio terminal (53) through a third interface (13) and the communication device (5) parentheses is so configured that it communicates through the second interface (12) by means of a first, universal protocol and in order to communicate with the mobile radio terminal through the third interface (13) it converts the first protocol into a third protocol.

However, in related art, Bork teaches that incorporates a control device (45, 47) (figure 19, item 62) for communication through the second interface (Figure 17, item 12) by means of a first, universal interface and for converting the first, universal protocol into a second, terminal-specific protocol (*Figures 17 and 19, a controller 62 for communication through the second interface 12 by means of a first, universal interface and for converting the first, universal protocol into a second, terminal-specific protocol 10; Also see Col 6, line 46-Col 7, line 22*); and in that the adapter part (43) has a communication device (6) (Figure 16, item 46) for wireless communication with a mobile radio terminal (53) (*Figure 16, item 54*) through a third interface (13) (*Figure 16, with wireless connection between antennas 42*) and the communication device (5) (Figure 16, item 46) parentheses is so configured that it communicates through the second interface (12) by means of a first, universal protocol (*Figure 15, item 12*) and in order to communicate with the mobile radio terminal (*Figure 16, item 54*) through the third

interface (13) it converts the first protocol into a third protocol (Figure 16, wireless connection between cradle 46 and mobile device 54 which convert the first protocol into a third protocol).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the above teaching of Bork to Van Bosch in order to communicate to other short distance RF communication enabled electronic devices.

Regarding claim 2, the combination of Van Bosch and Bork teach all the claimed elements in claim 1. In addition, Van Bosch teaches adapter part (43) as defined in claim 1, characterized in that the communication device (5) is so configured that it transmits data (56) through the second interface (12) (*Figure 2, items 28A and 28B*) that triggers the vehicle electronics (2) and/or enables the vehicle electronics (2) (*Figure 2, item 24*) to communicate with the communication device (5) (*Figure 2, item 22*) by means of the first protocol (*Col 4, lines 26-43*).

Regarding claim 3, the combination of Van Bosch and Bork teach all the claimed elements in claim 1. In addition, Van Bosch teaches adapter part (43) as defined in claim 2, characterized in that the communication device (5) is so configured that it determines whether or not the vehicle electronics (2) communicate through the second interface (12) with the first protocol and, if this is not the case, it transmits the data (56) (*Col 4, lines 11-43*).

Regarding claim 8, Van Bosch teaches connection system (11) to connect mobile radio terminals (51, 52, 53) with electronics (2) installed in a vehicle, the connection system (11) incorporating a base part (3) for permanent installation in the

vehicle (*Figure 1, base part 24 for permanent installation in the vehicle*) and one or a plurality of retaining parts (41, 42) (*Figure 2, retaining part 30*), each of which accommodates a mobile radio terminal (51, 52) (*Fig 2, item 22*), which can be connected to the base part (3) (*Figure 2, item 24*) through a second mechanical and electrical interface (12) (*Fig 2, items 28 A and 28B; Col 4, lines 26-43*); in that the connection system (11) also incorporates an adapter part (43, 71, 72, 73) that incorporates the second mechanical and electrical interface (12) (*Fig 2, items 28 A and 28B*) for electrical and mechanical connection of the adapter part (43, 71, 72, 73) to the base part (6) of the connection system (11) (*Figure 2, item 24; Col 4, lines 26-43*) in place of the retaining part (41, 42) (*Figure 2, item 30*), except for characterized in that the retaining part (41, 42) incorporates a control device for communication through the second interface by means of a first, universal protocol and for converting the first, universal protocol into a second, terminal-specific protocol; and in that the adapter part (43, 71, 72, 73) incorporates a communication device (5) for wireless communication with a mobile radio terminal (53) through a third interface (13), and the communication device (5) is so configured that it communicates through the second interface (12) by means of the first, universal protocol and in order to communicate with the mobile radio terminal (53) through the third interface (13) it converts the first protocol into a third protocol.

However, in related art, Bork teaches characterized in that the retaining part (41, 42) incorporates a control device (figure 19, item 62) for communication through the second interface (Figure 17, item 12) by means of a first, universal protocol and for

converting the first, universal protocol into a second, terminal-specific protocol (*Figures 17 and 19, a controller 62 for communication through the second interface 12 by means of a first, universal interface and for converting the first, universal protocol into a second, terminal-specific protocol 10; Also see Col 6, line 46-Col 7, line 22*); and in that the adapter part (43, 71, 72, 73) incorporates a communication device (5) (Figure 16, item 46) for wireless communication with a mobile radio terminal (53) (*Figure 16, item 54 through a third interface (13) (Figure 16, with wireless connection between antennas 42), and the communication device (5) (Figure 16, item 46) is so configured that it communicates through the second interface (12) by means of the first, universal protocol (Figure 15, item 12) and in order to communicate with the mobile radio terminal (53) (Figure 16, item 54) through the third interface (13) it converts the first protocol into a third protocol (Figure 16, wireless connection between cradle 46 and mobile device 54 which convert the first protocol into a third protocol*).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the above teaching of Bork to Van Bosch in order to communicate to other short distance RF communication enabled electronic devices.

7. Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Bosch (US Patent #6,792,296) in view of Bork (US Patent #6,255,800), and further in view of Chennakeshu et al. (US Patent # 6,542,758).

Regarding claim 9, the combination of Van Bosch and Bork fail to teach connection system (11) as defined in claim 8, characterized in that the base part (6) has

a first electrical interface for connection to a signal processing unit that is installed within the vehicle and performs at least some of the functions of a hands-free device.

However, in related art, Chennakeshu teaches connection system (11) as defined in claim 8, characterized in that the base part (6) has a first electrical interface for connection to a signal processing unit that is installed within the vehicle and performs at least some of the functions of a hands-free device (Col 7, lines 15-38).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the above teaching of Chennakeshu to Van Bosch and Bork in order to communicate among the various physical units (See Chennakeshu, Col 7, line 15).

Regarding claim 10, the combination of Van Bosch, Bork, and Chennakeshu teach all the claimed elements in claim 9. In addition, Chennakeshu teaches base part (3) as defined in claim 9, characterized in that the second mechanical and electrical interface (12) of the base part (3) is an interface for communication by means of one or a plurality of terminal-specific protocols (See abstract; Col 2, lines 47-58); and in that the communication device (5) is so configured that that it transmits data to the signal-processing unit that triggers the signal-processing unit (2) and/or enables the signal-processing unit (2) to communicate with the communication device (5) by means of the first protocol (See Abstract; Col 7, lines 15-38; Col 4, lines 40-59).

8. Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified

citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in its entirety as potentially teaching of all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Mitsuru et al. (US Pub. No. 2007/0178944, paragraphs 0006-0015); James Holmes et al. (US Pub. No. 2005/0176369, paragraph 0005); Bisplinghoff (US Pub. No. 2004/0132343, claim 1); Rode (US Pub. No. 2001/0045774, paragraph 0031), Sakajiri (US Patent #6,442,404), Morrison (US Patent #2005/0227746, Paragraphs 0026,0035,0045), Holmes et al. (US Pub. No. 2005/0197168, Paragraphs 0004 and 0017); Grant Friesen et al. (US Pub. No. 2005/0170867, Paragraphs 0002,0005); Herrod et al. (US Pub. No. 2003/0181168, paragraphs 0093 and 0143); Sychta (US Patent #7,308,289), Patterson et al. (US Patent #6,195,572), Kinzalow et al. (US Patent #6,052,603), Kortum et al. (US Pub. No. 2006/0116177, paragraph 0034).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DOMINIC E. REGO whose telephone number is (571)272-8132. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:30 am-5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Duc M. Nguyen can be reached on 571-272-7503. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Dominic E. Rego
/Dominic E Rego/
Examiner, Art Unit 2618
Tel 571-272-8132

/Duc Nguyen/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2618